



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,650	12/02/2003	Wenguang Ma	ALCN-101US2	4522
23122	7590	12/16/2005	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			VO, HAI	
P O BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980			PAPER NUMBER	
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Art Unit: 1771

1. All of the art rejections are maintained. Additionally, a new ground of rejection is made in view of provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over co-pending Application No. 10/175,649.

***Double Patenting***

2. Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/725,649. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/725,649 fully encompass the presently claimed subject matter in addition to the limitation of the anisotropic core material.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason et al (US 6,197,233) in view of Grinshpun et al (US 6,844,055) as evidenced by Chen et al (US 6,165,308) substantially as set forth in the 04/14/2005 Office Action.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason et al (US 6,197,233) in view of Grinshpun et al (US 6,844,055) as evidenced by Chen et al (US 6,165,308) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Tusim et al (US 6,213,540) substantially as set forth in the 04/14/2005 Office Action.
6. Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al (US 5,527,573) in view of Grinshpun et al (US 6,844,055) as evidenced by Chen et al (US 6,165,308) substantially as set forth in the 04/14/2005 Office Action.
7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al (US 5,527,573) in view of Grinshpun et al (US 6,844,055) as evidenced by Chen et al (US 6,165,308) as applied to claim 1, further in view of Tusim et al (US 6,213,540) substantially as set forth in the 04/14/2005 Office Action.

***Response to Arguments***

8. The art rejections over Mason in view of Grinshpun and Chen have been maintained for the following reasons. Applicants argue that there is no motivation to combine Mason with Grinshpun because no mention of polyester is made in Mason and Grinshpun mentions that styrene compounds are suitable alternative compounds for use in forming the foam strands. The arguments are not found persuasive for patentability. If Mason discloses the use of polyester, the art rejections will be made under the 102 rejections instead. Grinshpun discloses that the foam strands can be made from different polymeric compositions such as the combination of polyester and polystyrene (column 9, lines 60-67, column

Art Unit: 1771

10, lines 58-65 and claim 1). The teachings of Grinshpun give those skilled in the art the tools to conclude that the foam strands can be made from different polymeric compositions including the combination of polyester and polystyrene. The use of polyester in combination of polystyrene is possible and acceptable in forming the foam strands and Grinshpun provides necessary details to practice the invention of Mason. That is a motivation to combine the two references.

9. The art rejections over Park, Grinshpun and Chen have been maintained for the following reasons. Applicants argue that none of the cited references teach strands comprising a mixture of polypropylene and polyester. The examiner disagrees. Grinshpun teaches a cellular foam structure comprising a plurality of foam strands made from a mixture of polypropylene and polyester (column 9, lines 60-67, column 10, lines 58-65 and claim 1). The teachings of Grinshpun give those skilled in the art the tools to conclude that the foam strands can be made from different polymeric compositions including the combination of polyester and polypropylene. The use of polyester in combination of polypropylene is possible and acceptable in forming the foam strands and Grinshpun provides necessary details to practice the invention of Park. That is a motivation to combine the two references.

### ***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1771

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1485. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HV

*Hai Vo*

**HAIVO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**